

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his time during the telephone conversation of April 15, 2003.

Claims 6 and 19 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 7, 12, 20, and 21 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 19 and claim 6, upon which claim 19 depended. Claims 7 and 12 have been rewritten as independent claims with all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claims 20 and 21 have been amended to change their dependencies.

The Examiner noted that a "Brief Description of the Drawings" for figures A1-A46 and B1-B14 was missing. A "Brief Description of the Drawings" for these figures has been added.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-14, and 21-23, and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Imamura et al. in view of Wolfe et al. The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Imamura et al. in view of Wolfe et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Veeneman. The Examiner rejected claims 19-29, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Imamura and Wolfe in view of the "Amazon.com" web site.


Claim 1, which has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 19 and any intervening claim. Claim 1, as amended, recites a single payment process to purchase a plurality of items from a plurality of vendors. Claim 7 recites a cross-vendor shopping cart into which items selected from a plurality of vendors may be deposited. Claim 12 recites a shopping cart logic for receiving items from various web sites that have been selected by consumers to be placed into the universal shopping cart. As supported by the declaration submitted on April 1, 2003, the implementation of a single payment program or a single shopping cart for a plurality of vendors was not obvious at least at the time of the priority date of this application. As stated in the declaration, Amazon allowed multiple vendors to sell items, but had different shopping carts and purchase processes for each vendor. According to the declaration, after the priority date of this application, Amazon was able to sell products from ToysRUs using the same Amazon shopping cart. However,

this was not a multiple vendor sale, since Amazon kept inventory and shipped products for both Amazon and ToysRUs, so that Amazon was the single vendor for both types of products. The declaration supports that the invention as recited in claims 1, 7, and 12, as amended, is not obvious in that Amazon was willing to invest \$5 million into Altura to be able to have the multi-vendor single purchase, single shopping cart system, as recited in the claims. For at least these reasons claims 1, 7, and 12 are not made obvious by Imamura and Wolfe in view of the "Amazon.com" web site.

Claims 2-3, 8-11, 13-14, and 20-26 each depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims, and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims. Additionally, these dependent claims require additional elements that when taken in the context of the claimed invention, further patentably distinguish the art of record. For at least these reasons, claims 2-3, 8-11, 13-14, and 20-26 are not made obvious by Imamura and Wolfe in view of the "Amazon.com" web site or Veeneman.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at telephone number (831) 655-2300.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Michael Lee
Registration No. 31,846

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(831) 655-2300